

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 04-7830

SIMON BANKS, t/a Judge Banks' Group,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

CHARLES C. PAK, Detective; CYNTHIA FRANK;
JAMES RICHARDSON, Detective; JOHN GRIFFITH;
JAMES W. HENDERSON,

Defendants - Appellees,

and

WILLIAM D. EUILLE, Mayor; VIRGINIA STATE BAR;
ELLIOTT J. CASEY, Assistant Commonwealth
Attorney; S. RANDOLPH SENDEL, Commonwealth
Attorney,

Defendants.

No. 04-7842

SIMON BANKS, t/a Judge Banks' Group,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

ELLIOTT J. CASEY, Assistant Commonwealth
Attorney; S. RANDOLPH SENDEL, Commonwealth
Attorney,

Defendants - Appellees,

and

CHARLES C. PAK, Detective; CYNTHIA FRANK;
WILLIAM D. EUILLE, Mayor; VIRGINIA STATE BAR;
JAMES RICHARDSON, Detective; JOHN GRIFFITH;
JAMES W. HENDERSON,

Defendants.

No. 05-6357

SIMON BANKS, t/a Judge Banks' Group,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

CHARLES C. PAK, Detective; JOHN GRIFFITH;
JAMES W. HENDERSON,

Defendants - Appellees,

and

CYNTHIA FRANK; WILLIAM D. EUILLE, Mayor;
VIRGINIA STATE BAR; JAMES RICHARDSON,
Detective; ELLIOTT J. CASEY, Assistant
Commonwealth Attorney; S. RANDOLPH SENDEL,
Commonwealth Attorney,

Defendants.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the Eastern
District of Virginia, at Alexandria. T. S. Ellis III, District
Judge. (CA-04-625)

Submitted: July 14, 2005

Decided: July 26, 2005

Before WILKINSON, LUTTIG, and MOTZ, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Simon Banks, Appellant Pro Se. Jonathan Donald Westreich,
Alexandria, Virginia; Alexander Francuzenko, O'CONNELL, O'CONNELL
& SARFIELD, Rockville, Maryland, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.
See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

In these consolidated appeals, Simon Banks appeals district court orders denying his motion for injunctive relief, granting the motion to dismiss two Defendants on the basis of prosecutorial immunity and dismissing his complaint for failing to state a claim. We have reviewed the record and the district court orders and affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. See Banks v. Pak, No. CA-04-625 (E.D. Va., filed Sept. 2, 2004; entered Sept. 7, 2004; filed Oct. 18, 2004; entered Oct. 19, 2004; Feb. 2, 2005). We deny Banks' motion to file a supplemental brief in No. 05-6357. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED